

The Office Action states that the Lebold et al. reference is now cited as the primary reference throughout the new 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections. Lebold is being cited as disclosing a method and apparatus for manufacturing complex cores in which a vertical parted mold having two halves, each defining patterns and impressions of a volute turbo-charger housing, is used to surround a complex core defining an imprint "involute" surfaces that further comprise mandrels with removable segments. The reference is further cited for having a molten metal pouring basin that communicates with a sprue comprising a gate with a J-shaped backsplash design defined in at least one side of the patterns, into which pattern(s) the involute impression is imprinted. After a careful examination of Lebold, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that Lebold teaches each and every limitation as claimed.

With respect to each of the references cited by the Examiner, Applicant notes that independent Claims 1 and 24 contain the limitation "at least one of said side patterns having a core, the core defining an involute imprint surface and a gate to a cavity formed by the first and second impressions." Applicant respectfully asserts that Lebold et al. does not teach or suggest a "core" defining an involute imprint surface and an gate to a cavity. Further, independent Claim 34 includes the limitation "the core has an imprint surface and defines a gate therethrough, the gate defining a backsplash." Applicant asserts that Lebold does not contain a core having an imprint surface that defines a gate therethrough, the gate defining a backsplash.


Applicant respectfully asserts that each and every limitation of the independent claims are not shown in the references cited. As such, rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is improper.

The Examiner cites Lebold as teaching a molten metal pouring basin which communicates with a sprue comprising a gate with a J-shaped backsplash design defined within at least side pattern, into which patterns the involute impression is imprinted. Applicant notes that while Lebold may teach a J-shaped cast component (see Figure 7 of Lebold), it does not teach a sprue comprising a gate with a J-shaped backsplash. This said, Applicant notes that this limitation is not in independent Claim 1.

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1243.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 9 - 2002

By:   
Charles H. Blair, Reg. No. 19,734  
Christopher A. Eusebi, Reg. No. 44,672

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600